

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were pending in the application and all were rejected. Claims 1-6 have been canceled. Claims 7-18 had been previously canceled. New claims 19-27 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the new claims can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Patent Publication 2005/0114867, specifically at paragraphs [0016], [0018], [0029], [0030], and [0034]. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann et al. (US Patent 6,654,801) in view of Bickle (US 20030114163), in view of Dillow (US Patent 7,140,025).

Claims 1-6 have been canceled and replaced with claims 19-27. The rejections of claims 1-6 will be addressed with respect to new claims 19-27 since the new claims merely serve to clarify the inventive process and contain essentially the same elements as claims 1-6.

The Office Action at page 3 states that Mann teaches "generating a trigger message based on the predetermined event." Applicant disagrees and directs the Examiner to the Final Office Action dated February 6, 2008 at page 4, third paragraph: "Mann and Bickle do not

explicitly teach generating command [sic].” The Non-Final Office Action dated August 23, 2007 also states that Mann does not teach generating the command.

The Office Action conceded that Mann does not teach “if the integration broker detects loss of connectivity with the application, restarting application,” but alleges that Bickle provides for this deficiency. Applicant disagrees. Bickle’s radio software method relies on a subsystem that is only able to restart the device on which the subsystem is installed.

Bickle does not teach or suggest an ability to restart a **remote** application, as recited in claim 19. See Bickle at paragraph [0027]: “This invention configures the Domain Management subsystem to detect when a device is busy, off-line, or disabled to increase efficiency. The Domain Management subsystem is further configured to detect an application or device failure and to automatically restart the failed application or device in response. By including a primary Domain Management subsystem and one or more secondary Domain Management subsystems, one of the secondary Domain Management subsystems can invoke the management functions of the primary Domain Management subsystem in the event of failure.”

The Office Action concedes that Mann and Bickle do not explicitly teach “using a queue manager to monitor messaging between the applications, wherein the trigger message enables the remote application to be started automatically when there are messages available to retrieve, generating an activate command. Dillow is said to teach these claim elements at col. 10, lines 3-10, and col. 10, lines 55-67.

Applicant must disagree. Dillow is not monitoring messaging between an integration broker and a remote application in order to know when to respond with a start or stop. Dillow is

concerned with swapping CPU usage among threads in a program. See Dillow at Col. 7, lines 22-29: “When a client connect request **315** for a logical communications connection from the CSCM **308** is detected, the operating system or a network subsystem in the transaction server **304** “wakes up” the main thread **302** to process the connection request. In this manner, the main thread **302** does not monopolize a CPU of the transaction server **304** and allows other threads and processes to operate concurrently.”

Dillow deals with managing threads, not remote applications. Dillow defines a thread as follows: “A thread is an encapsulation of the flow of control in a program.” Col. 6, lines 43-44. Dillow wakes the appropriate thread when it is needed; Dillow does not teach or suggest transmitting a start/stop command to a remote application in response to a trigger message. See Dillow at Col. 10, lines 63-Col. 11, line 1: “When a message is deposited in the in-memory write queue (e.g., by the read thread **316** or the monitor thread **312**), a condition signal is triggered to wake the write thread **318** to wake out of its “blocking wait” state and to perform a network write of the message detected in the in-memory write queue.”

The cited references, whether individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of claim 19; therefore claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 20-27 are dependent on claim 19 and are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 19 is patentable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: November 8, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)